

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 222 312

RC 013 629

AUTHOR Meier, Ellen; Edington, Everett D.
TITLE Research Synthesis: Teacher Preparation for Rural Schools.
SPONS AGENCY Western Montana Coll., Dillon.
PUB DATE Oct 82
NOTE 31p.
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Curriculum; *College Role; College School Cooperation; Community Characteristics; Community Involvement; Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; Problems; Rural Areas; *Rural Schools; School Community Relationship; Teacher Centers; Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education Programs; *Teacher Educators; Teacher Role; Teaching Load

ABSTRACT

A review of the literature on teacher preparation and inservice programs in rural areas encompasses dilemmas facing rural education, what colleges and universities can do, and implications for colleges and universities. Part 1 describes dilemmas facing rural educators, not only in terms of class load, multiple preparations, extracurricular duties, etc., but also in terms of isolation and community problems such as cliques, gossip, and small town talk. Part 2 shows how colleges and universities can provide needed interventions for rural schools by assessing rural needs, providing special training programs for rural educators, bringing visibility of universities to rural communities, responding to rural needs, creating off-campus centers to more effectively meet teacher training needs, and building curriculum expertise. "Implications for Higher Education," part 3, discusses expansion of the role of colleges and universities to include off-site training opportunities for preservice and inservice, a shift in the role of the professors to "resource people for long term staff development programs," creation of effective rural educator intervention models, and playing a more aggressive role in preparing teachers and administrators for rural areas. The conclusion stresses the need for colleges and universities to work directly with and in rural communities and maintain ongoing relationships with rural educators. (AH)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED2222312

RESEARCH SYNTHESIS: TEACHER PREPARATION FOR RURAL SCHOOLS

Ellen Meier, President
Communications and Technology
White Plains, New York

Everett D. Edington, Director
ERIC/CRESS
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, New Mexico

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Alan B. Zetler

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Prepared Under a Grant from Western Montana College

October 1982

RC 01 3629

RESEARCH SYNTHESIS: TEACHER PREPARATION FOR RURAL SCHOOLS

Introduction

Rural America has been receiving increased attention during the last decade. Small towns are regaining some of their popularity as city dwellers migrate out of highly concentrated urban areas to find more satisfaction in rural styles. Historically, this is a recent trend, however. Since World War II, urbanization has been a principal characteristic of change in the U.S. population, with the result that "the people of rural America, in essence, have become a forgotten minority" (Muse, 1977).

Rural America is more likely than other areas to have a higher percentage of poverty, poorer housing standards, fewer cultural attractions, less opportunity for adequate medical care, less opportunity to attract federal and state funding for programs, and the lowest levels of education. Rural areas have been deprived of their fair share of America's wealth and public services and have been excluded from the standard of living enjoyed in metropolitan areas of the United States (Sher, 1978).

One should be warned, however, against generalizing about rural communities. Rural areas may be internally more homogeneous than urban communities, but they differ widely from each other. "Rural American may well represent the single most diverse and heterogeneous group of individuals and communities in our society. The island village off the coast of Maine, a coal-mining town in West Virginia, a ranching area in Wyoming, a college town in Minnesota, an impoverished community in the Mississippi Delta region, a ski-resort section of Vermont, a migrant-worker settlement in Texas, an Alaskan Native village near the Arctic Circle, and a prosperous grain-farming area in Iowa have little in common, except

that they are all classified as rural areas of the United States" (Sher, 1978:31).

Schools are a key to the "quality of life" issues which face rural communities. Schools traditionally have been perceived as the means for integrating individuals into society for providing an historical and cultural base, and for providing students with the skills to become productive members of society.

Additional responsibilities are placed upon the rural schools. "Rural and small schools must not only prepare their students for life in the local community, but also for the adjustment into more urban communities, so that their students are able to function efficiently in both environments" (Gardner & Edington, 1982). Further, our rapidly-changing technology demands that schools, and perhaps rural schools in particular, prepare students for an ever-changing society. Rural education is changing at an accelerated pace brought on by technological advances, energy problems, and demographic shifts. Students must be prepared through education to function well in an environment where accelerated change is the only constant.

Rural students also differ from their urban counterparts. Compared to the typical children in an urban area, the rural child still has fewer opportunities to study in a particular area of interest and fewer chances to become prepared for post-high school experiences (Muse, 1978). A report on rural high school graduates in nine districts, done by Abt in 1977, found that rural students sampled, relative to the urban sample, were more satisfied with the counseling they received but expressed less confidence in their schools' academic instruction, reputation in the community, and the adequacy of extracurricular facilities.

Teachers and administrators also face many challenges in rural areas. First, the very values that give some educators satisfaction in a rural area are the cause of grief for others not prepared for the experience (Castro, 1981).

Teachers and administrators must work in isolated communities, often juggling more than one subject, teaching more than one grade with little inservice support, and with limited budgets for the entire educational system (Muse, 1980). Administrators often wear more than one hat, and are usually stretched [very thin] as they try to coordinate curriculum, teach when needed, respond to the many forms required by state and federal education departments, and still serve as educational leaders.

Preparing teachers for rural areas is the role of the teacher education departments of colleges and universities. But institutes of higher education serving rural areas are also confronted with many demands. They are trying to comply with a multitude of professional and legal requirements mandated by state legislatures and federal court decisions. Typically, they do not have a separate department or unit to prepare teachers for rural areas; most do not even have specific courses for those interested in teaching in rural schools. Perhaps most discouraging, however, is that many are not aware of the special needs of rural schools. Without this awareness, concerns cannot be adequately assessed, and the resources of colleges or universities cannot be organized to address the issues facing rural educators.

The purpose of this document is to review the literature of teacher preparation and inservice for rural areas. The discussion will be organized into three parts: dilemmas facing rural education, what colleges and universities can do and implications for colleges and universities. (See appendix for explanation of specific models).

Dilemmas Facing Rural Education

Colleges and universities interested in providing inservice and preservice programs for rural educators must first thoroughly understand the problems facing rural youth and rural schools. Although "rural education" like "rural America" encompasses a great variety of settings, making it difficult if not impossible to generalize, rural schools have historically shared several common

problems. Sher cites several general problems which have troubled rural schools:

...reducing student enrollment and absenteeism, recruiting highly competent teachers and administrators, providing special education and other specialized services, securing needed capital and operating funds, and compensating for the inherent isolation and population sparsity of rural areas, are all problems which have persistently plagued rural schools and which remain largely unsolved even today. (Sher, 1978)

Many things contribute to this list of difficulties. One overall theme found throughout the literature is financial in nature: financial constraints severely limit rural schools' ability to provide adequately for staff and students. A 1980 Rand Corporation study states, "If there was a single dominant theme that rural administrators sought time and time again to convey, it was that allocation of funds on a per pupil basis places rural districts at a disadvantage" (Bass & Berman 1979). Even though in 1980 small school districts (identified as those communities with 2,500 inhabitants or less by the U.S. Census Bureau) represented 75% of all school districts, and 19% of all students, many of the nation's policies, funding formulas and innovative trends tend to focus much more on the urban school than on the rural. For instance, Muse and Stonebacher (1979) report that during the last 30 years, non-metropolitan schools received 5% of the research money, 11% of materials and media dollars, 13% of vocational education, and 13% of the money to improve programs to reduce the dropout rate. Another study by Bass and Berman (1979) found a number of funding discrepancies in Titles IVB and IVC concerning rural and urban districts. Their report concludes that, "on the basis of the analysis of Title IVC in our sample states, a highly competitive concentrated funding strategy apparently places rural districts at a competitive disadvantage in both applying for and receiving grants."

Fratoe (1978), in a report examining educational services and aid to rural schools, shows that federal aid to metro-central schools in 1972-73 was \$133.33 per student, but only \$91.10 per non-metro student. His study demonstrates that

during that year rural public schools spent less per pupil than metro-central or suburban public schools in all categories except student transportation.

"Such an adverse allocation of federal funds to rural schools would be understandable if the problems of rural schools are proportionately less severe than those of urban schools. But just the opposite is clearly the case" (Herriott, 1980).

Various studies have shown that rural public school education lags behind metro-central and suburban public school education in virtually all areas. "Rural students not only attend schools with fewer support staff and services, less revenue and less per pupil funding, but they are also more likely to enroll in school later, progress through school more slowly, complete fewer school years, and score lower on national tests than students attending metro area schools" (Fratoe, 1978). Many other studies suggest students' need for more exposure to a greater variety of subjects, and the ability to pursue them in more depth.

In talking with teachers, researchers have found a multitude of problems. Perhaps the biggest is the very fact that the community is rural and therefore isolated. Rural teachers still tend to come from the communities in which they teach, and practical considerations of distance and housing availability generally compel them to live near their schools. The close ties between school and teacher that inevitably develop are commendable, but can put pressures on teachers as well as children (Sher, 1978). A survey by Muse, Hoppe and Parsons in 1975 reports that teachers find "community cliques, gossip and small town talk" among the chief drawbacks to country teaching.

Muse (1980) identifies several other difficulties--economic and professional that influence teachers in rural areas:

1. They have 3-5 preparations daily.
2. They must teach a class or two in which they're not adequately trained.

3. Teachers are expected to take on extracurricular duties.
4. Junior and senior high school are combined. Subjects like home economics and physical education are often made up of students from 2 or 3 grade levels.
5. Budgets are very low and supplies are not readily available.
6. Teachers' salaries are low.
7. Teachers are less apt to receive inservice training and must travel far to receive advanced degrees.

These are some of the conditions which shape teaching behavior in rural schools and can serve to deter professionals from devoting more time to the task of teaching itself. These conditions may also help explain a common criticism about rural teaching: the lack of "creative and innovative teaching". Sher (1978) calls this the most frequent and serious problem cited in the literature.

The task of organizing the curriculum is usually left up to the teacher. Because of the diversity of subject areas and the range of grades, teachers face an enormous curricular challenge. "Further, textbook companies and other curriculum develop producers have ignored the needs of rural schools because the numbers involved are so small as to limit profitability. The widely accepted assumption is that, since education is a generic endeavor, rural schools are just smaller versions of large schools and the curriculum should therefore be the same" (Nachtigal, 1980). Add to this the fact that curriculum material available is often limited or outdated or both, and one begins to understand why it may be difficult for rural teachers to be creative and innovative.

The administrative organization of rural districts varies between the states. In some states, the same person serves as principal and superintendent, and may teach as well. In others, the districts are organized into supervisory unions with one superintendent providing administrative services for a group of local

boards. The Rank report (Bass & Berman 1979) found that while administrative problems differ, serious administrative limitations appear to be inherent in rural districts no matter what the political arrangements. The "weak administrative infrastructure" in rural districts may contribute to a cycle of deprivation in some rural schools. The districts may be at a disadvantage in identifying and documenting special needs among students that would make them eligible for special types of funding or in applying successfully for these funds and the districts may not be able to implement such specially-funded programs. This is the institutional equivalent of the old saying that "the rich get richer" an educational organization must have money and staff before it can acquire and use other monies and programs effectively.

In a study of Warner and Kale (1981) the authors state that higher education has not responded to the needs of rural America. They also charge that teacher training institutes have been the victims of the lure of federal money that is tied to meeting urban needs.

They [institutes of higher education] continue to produce teachers who are far better prepared to work in more populated areas than in sparsely populated communities. Perhaps even worse, these institutions are not focusing their research and development efforts on the problems of rural education. Even universities located in rural areas are neglecting this important area of research...Professional educators and teaching institutions must begin to recognize the need to prepare teachers for the less than adequately supplied classroom, the student reared in a less than cosmopolitan environment and the central office support staff which serve in more than a single capacity.

Sher also found that teacher training programs in the United states have paid little attention to the needs of teachers in small rural schools.

"Although the literature is full of moaning about the poor quality of rural teachers, little systematic effort has been made to recruit the best people for rural schools, and even less effort has been made to train them properly" (Sher, 1978).

"Properly," according to Warner and Kale (1981), includes more flexibility and responsiveness. "Currently, dual certification in many instances means an additional two years in course studies and internships. A teacher certified in one area forces specialization at a time when rural schools need good generalists." They conclude, "if higher education does not provide local educational agencies with the personnel, skills, talents, basics, they will ignore the university as a 'tomb' of philosophical rhetoric..."

Sher (1978) points out that although rural schools could obviously benefit from better teachers, how "better" is defined makes all the difference.

In fact, a very persuasive case can be made that higher academic credentials, in and of themselves, have minimal validity as a measure of actual teaching competence; that rural schools require competent generalists far more than a variety of specialists; and that teachers trained to understand and work with the unique strengths and weaknesses of rural schools are much more desirable than urban-trained and urban-oriented teachers from even the most prestigious universities.

Ivey (1979) makes another point, however, noting that teachers spend very little time focusing on education in general--only 20-30 hours, compared to engineers who are required to spend 75 hours in specific engineering studies. This has led to a call for increased professionalism. The literature suggests that colleges and universities are not requiring enough course work in the area of education, and that the course work required tends to train individuals for specialized educational responsibilities, rather than general skills more applicable in rural settings.

When attempting to identify the most difficult barriers to establishing specific preparation programs for teacher leaders or administrators for schools in rural America, Drier (1977) received a variety of responses from AACTE members in Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. The responses ran the gamut from lack of time to set aside for work in local district setting to ignorance about the needs, structures and processes of rural schools. Drier organized all

of the responses into four general categories:

Concerns about resources (money, time, personnel).

Concerns about commitment and responsibility (both individual and institutional)

Political and bureaucratic constraints

Knowledge/research concerns

These concerns are significant and real, and help explain the barriers colleges and universities face as they attempt to develop relevant resources for rural educators.

What Colleges and Universities Can Do

Colleges and universities are in a position to provide the needed interventions for rural schools. According to Ivey (1979), they are the logical entity to assume a large share of the responsibility for studying many aspects of rural education, including preparation of educators and delivery of service. However, for this to occur, it appears that new directions and priorities must be established. In this document, the discussion will focus on institutes of higher education and what they can do to contribute to solutions for rural schools. This is not to minimize the role of other institutions, state or federal governments, or individuals within the rural communities, but will provide a focus for consideration by institutes of higher education. Although at this time there is not a well-developed comprehensive effort among institutions of higher education, it should be noted that in the recent "rediscovery" of rural education, institutes of higher education are in many cases part of the ground swell (Ivey, 1979).

The literature is replete with general recommendations for colleges and universities, and there seems to be overall agreement about several points. First, the need to assess rural concerns. Paul Nachtigal (1980) makes the point more generally: "The general lack of responsiveness of service delivery systems

to rural education problems is due, at least in part, to the lack of good information about the nature of rural communities and rural schools. Warner and Kale (1981) recommend that much more study and attention be given to understanding rural communities. They suggest specifically that institutes of higher education periodically study the status of rural education, analyze and synthesize successful rural classroom practices, including staff characteristics of rural "master teachers", and better understand community dynamics in school relations, including comparison of student aspirations and attitudes. Jacobsmeyer (1980) agrees, noting that the role of higher education should include assessing rural needs, collecting data on small rural districts, and conducting research in rural schools.

Using this knowledge as a foundation, the second point that seems to have unanimous support is the need for colleges and universities to provide special training programs for rural schools. This general notion is given different emphasis by different researchers, but all are in agreement on the need to provide a specific rural approach. Jacobsmeyer (1980) simply recommends that universities and colleges provide resources for establishing specialized rural preservice and inservice training programs. Jonathon Sher (1978) elaborates on this point in two recommendations to legislators.

1. Require state-supported colleges and graduate schools of education across the country to create special training programs which will explicitly prepare teachers for service in rural schools. At present there are no more than a handful of teacher training programs in the entire nation which directly assist students interested in rural education careers. Teachers are still the backbone of any school system, and the fact that rural schools must accept teachers without specialized rural training puts them at a disadvantage they can ill afford. Therefore, this is the highest-priority alternative.

2. Expand inservice training (and other professional development activities) for rural teachers and administrators. In most rural communities, the professional growth and development of school personnel is impeded, first by the fact that rural districts rarely provide continuing inservice programs and, second, by the fact that the kinds of external opportunities for professional development available in urban areas (e.g., teacher centers and universities) are notably absent in rural areas. It is unreasonable to expect teachers and

administrators, already burdened by the heavy work loads characteristic of rural schools, to do everything on their own time and of their own initiative. Teachers need time to share ideas and problems with their counterparts, both within their own and in other school systems. They also need the time and resources to develop curricular materials, take needed courses and keep up with recent advances in their fields.

In addition, Sher asks legislators to establish a program of appropriate technical assistance to small rural schools and school districts.

Legislation could be enacted which directs the state education agency, state institutions of higher education or other appropriate groups to offer a full range of technical assistance services to small rural communities. However, it is imperative that this assistance be appropriate--that is, directed toward creating better rural schools rather than replacing them with second-hand imitations of urban/suburban schools (Sher, 1978).

Ivan Muse refines this point by suggesting that some university faculty be asked to specialize in rural education.

A specialist in rural education would be better able to gain the respect of practitioners in rural areas because he/she would be able to provide leadership in inservice education, curriculum development etc., as well as assist in the training of those individuals who wish to work in rural schools" (Muse, 1977)

A third point made by several authors is the need to collaborate with rural schools. Whitfield (1981) cites the need "for collaboration on the part of all parties involved." He defines collaboration, not as "just good will", but an agreed-upon "distribution of power, status, and authority." He advocates university visibility in the rural community, which would develop the feeling of accessibility from the community's perspective. Muse (1977) also emphasizes the need for cooperative relationships. "...Schools must learn to utilize in positive and productive ways, the public school system, state educational agencies, regional educational service centers, teacher groups and all others in the larger community of which they are a part. Rural teacher training, to be effective, calls for new school roles and parity relationships through a consortium of concerned groups working together in a viable partnership." (Muse, 1977).

This leads to the fourth theme--the need for responsiveness to rural needs by colleges and universities. Whitfield (1981) notes that institutions of higher education need "environments for functioning in field-responsive modes." Teacher education will shift from providing credit and credentialling to entering into long term agreements with local school districts as resource people for long term staff inservice development programs."

The fifth point made by several writers, often in tandem with the need to be more field-responsive, is the need to create off-campus centers which could more effectively meet teacher-training needs. Whitfield foresees a shift from the university campus to the field. Muse also suggests that any inservice or renewal opportunity, if truly responsive, would be held at least part of the time in the school districts.

What is needed is a new concept of education personnel development. This concept sees training as taking place partly on campus and partly in the school districts. Teaching centers or cooperating units will serve as development areas in which training, research, and discussions are held. Professors coming to these centers on a regular basis to assist the training of preservice teachers will be reeducated to the "real life" in the schools. They will receive as well as give new insights into educational problems. As interaction occurs, distinctions between the college faculty and the public school faculty will fade as training (preservice and inservice) and research efforts become the responsibility of all members of the education profession. (Muse, 1977).

Finally, several authors discuss the need to build curriculum expertise. A recent paper by Gardener and Edington (1982) details the need for help in organizing curriculum for rural schools. The paper cites Sher's (1977) reasons for the scarcity of curricular offerings in rural areas: (1) there is no profit for commercial publishers to produce books specifically for rural or small schools; (2) neither the government nor philanthropic organizations have subsidized the development of curricula or curricular material; and (3) rural areas lack the funds, expertise and the time to develop their own curricular materials (Sher 1977).

The need for curriculum expertise was substantiated by Dr. Benedict Surwill who found in a survey completed in 1980 that administrators felt prospective teachers should be required to demonstrate effective curriculum planning for small schools. Gardener and Edington and others also cite the need to prepare teachers for teaching and managing multiple grade level classes or teaching subjects in which they have inadequate background (Sher, 1977; Muse 1977; Ivey 1979). For high school teachers, experience in one minor and one major were suggested (Surwill, 1980). Finally, Gardener and Edington quote a number of researchers to make the point that generalists rather than specialists are needed.

- Rural schools and teachers who are (contradictory as it may sound) specially trained to be generalists
- The best rural teachers are the ones who are able to cope with sparsity, utilize community resources, invent curricular materials, and, above all else, are oriented toward teaching children rather than subjects (Sher, 1977).

These general themes form a framework for institutes of higher education to use in building the curriculum for rural educators. If colleges and universities would assess rural needs, provide special training or programs, collaborate with rural communities and other institutions, insure institutional responsiveness to rural concerns, and create off campus centers or train at least part of the time on school sites, they will have built the foundation for successful rural teacher preparation.

Once the framework is established, however, how should the curriculum be designed for training rural educators? At least part of the answer to this question lies in some of the assumptions which form the framework. That is, if institutions of higher education are accurately assessing rural needs and if they are truly responsive, they will build their curriculum around the present and emerging needs of rural schools.

Specific curriculum components can also be derived by examining the qualities possessed by successful rural educators. Tom Gjelten describes fundamental elements of a rural school, stating that rural schools should incorporate:

- A strong foundation in the teaching of basic skills and essential facts.
- An emphasis on practical skills and learning by doing.
- Training in self-directed study and the development of initiative.
- A focus on the local rural community.
- A commitment to familiarizing students with the outside world.
- An emphasis on the options available to rural youths both within and beyond the local community (Gjelten, 1978).

If these elements are defined behaviorally, for educational students, they could easily become curriculum objectives for institutes of higher education.

Glendor Castro, director of a multi-state outreach project based in Utah, has defined several criteria to determine employee satisfaction and success in a rural school. He tries to assess a prospective employee's strengths, and needs in terms of the following criteria:

Previous experience in a rural environment

If persons have not had previous work experience in sparsely populated areas, then a sponsored site visit should be provided so that potential service providers can see for themselves if they can live and work successfully in a particular rural environment. Helge (1981) identified geographic factors such as marginal highways and far-reaching distances between schools as being major problems in rural areas. If one is used to these conditions, they are not seen as major problems; if one is not, they can be devastating.

Appreciation of rural cultures

One doesn't have to understand and appreciate rural cultures to function in them, but such understanding and appreciation does contribute to job-effectiveness. Greenbaum (1968) reported on a director of a small, rural mental health clinic who utilized his ability to understand local cultures to achieve success in a rural clinic. Withholding judgment about mores not only prevents problems, but facilitates being accepted into a local culture rapidly. Such small items as learning about local history and geography, and learning survival language phrases in local minority languages contribute to one's acceptance.

Professional independence

One of the biggest frustrations for professionals in rural areas is not having the ability to consult with other professionals on a daily basis.

Furthermore, the inability to participate in meaningful inservice training further compounds the problem. The solution seems to be two-fold. First recruit those individuals who are self-sufficient and able to function somewhat independently on the job; and second, develop systems of inservice training that work in rural areas. Such systems, whether they be the highly structured ongoing inservice training advocated by Fredericks et al. (1975) or packaged inservice training as advocated by Hofmeister (1976) provide the necessary updating of skills.

Personal support System

Having a personal support system consisting of friends and co-workers who live and work in the same rural area is also important for the rural professional. Having people in the same community who can be depended on in case of emergencies, who allow the worker to share personal feelings, and who provide positive reinforcement and constructive criticism is crucial. Many times, this personal support system will maintain a rural area professional in a community even if his job is not entirely satisfactory.

Rural recreational interests

Having recreational or leisure time interests that match the rural environment provide the potential teacher with several benefits. The first benefit is that leisure time activities can serve as "time outs" from job stress. In fact, not having interests can contribute to job burnout since the worker finds leisure time very boring or frustrating. "There's nothing to do in this community" is a common complaint of professionals in rural areas. Job burnout is defined as loss of job effectiveness with associated emotional and physical disorders and complaints; this often results from prolonged and unmanageable stress which can be both job and environment related. (Castro, 1981).

Without these attributes, Castro suggests that teachers may not be appropriately matched with rural areas. This list is based on real problems faced by teachers in rural areas, and could very well serve as a foundation for rural education programs, in institutions of higher education.

Retaining teachers has been another problem in rural areas. Again, Castro identifies several criteria, grouping his points into two categories: job related influences and local environment influences. Under job related influences, Castro lists the following variables: satisfaction with defined duties, physical environment in which work is conducted, salary and fringe benefits, relationships with supervisor and co-workers, reinforcement from

student or clients, availability of support services, and finally, inservice training opportunities.

Under influences related to the local environment, Castro describes the importance of cultural and recreational opportunities, acceptance by members of rural communities and acceptance of local geography and climate. Again, these factors could be most helpful to colleges and universities in building inservice programs relevant to rural needs. Specific sessions could be designed around topics to build the potential for teacher administrator longevity in a particular location.

So far, a generic framework has been presented, along with two different methods of setting specific goals for rural educators. The final question is how to implement these ideas to bring about teacher improvement in rural areas.

Paul Nachtigal states that:

Central to any school improvement program is leadership development--creating within those involved the new perspectives, new skills, and understandings that will allow a program to move forward....Critical to such a strategy is a little money to buy the participants' time to develop their capabilities, coupled with sensitive program leadership to help participants think about the problems they wish to address and point them in the direction of other individuals and programs that can be helpful.

A companion strategy to freeing people from day-to-day routines for personal and/or program development is to bring new ideas and assistance to small rural schools on a regular basis. We have noted earlier that how these ideas and assistance are brought is as important as the substance of the ideas and assistance. Timing is very important; help is needed when it's needed, not before or after. The establishment of a basic level of trust between those bringing the assistance and those receiving the assistance is also essential.

Care must be taken in whatever strategies are implemented, to be sure that they contribute to local capacity-building, and not to dependency on central education agencies, for it is at the local school level that more suitable education programs for rural communities need to emerge. (Nachtigal, 1980).

This care and attention to the process of intervention and assistance is often overlooked in the excitement of building a rural center or sharing the latest technology. And yet this understanding of how to effectively work with

rural educators is perhaps the key for institutes of higher education. Warner and Kale (1981) refer to this briefly when they urge universities to engage in more research to adequately understand the needs of rural educators, to determine how these needs can be met, and, "equally important, to coordinate the dissemination and diffusion in the development of strategies which would bring about proper change for the improvement of rural America".

The Rand change agent study examined 293 federally-funded change agent projects across the country and focused on implementation of innovations through in-depth case studies. Ann Lieberman (1977) summarizes the Rand study in six points:

1. Effective implementation is dependent on supportive setting and on a strategy that fostered mutual adaptation of staff to project demands.
2. Within-program variations affected implementation more significantly than did differences among federal programs.
3. Projects using similar methods varied in their implementation strategies and institutional settings. The variations were more important than the methods or technologies.
4. Elementary school principals facilitate or inhibit implementation.
5. These elements of implementation strategies promoted teacher change:
 - a. Staff training
 - b. Frequent and regular meetings
 - c. Meetings and training
 - d. Quality and amount of change required by project
 - e. Local material development (in Title III Projects).
6. The more concentrated the resources were (Title III), the more likely was teacher change. (Adapted Lieberman from Berman, P., and Pauley, El., 1975).

Lieberman pointed out that this study, like others, documented once again that the local setting influences the course of innovation. She summarizes some thoughts that are very relevant to rural settings.

The approach to the linking processes described was basically developmental and interactive. It was suggested that linkage agencies recognize a dynamic response to the functions they perform, that the process of diagnosis, strategy building and so on all take place continuously and not in any linear order.

The processes described recognized that there is a tension between leaving school people with the ability to solve their own problems and learning specific information from outsiders. For the linkage agency, this tension creates the necessity to work with both a people and task orientation.. Content must be linked to the social system of the school and a respect for the realities of the work life of the people involved.

Implications for Colleges and Universities

If enacted, many of the suggestions and recommendations from the literature will require specific and concrete changes for colleges and universities. First, the role of the university will expand, with more emphasis being given to finding off-site training opportunities for preservice and inservice rural education. Muse (1977) makes this point most strongly when he advocates partial training on campus and partial training in the school districts. Whitfield (1981) agrees, predicting a major shift from the university campus to the field along, with a move from credentialling to providing non-credit staff development assistance.

The second major implication for higher education is a shift in the role of the professor. Whitfield explains that professors will become "resource people for long term staff development programs". This theme is echoed by Drummond (1978) when he ventures that new roles would be in order for university professors. He foresees that faculty will move toward being "linkers, reference sources, resource retrievers, instructional managers, diagnoser and prescriber, designer of programs and materials for non-traditional students." Also, professors will be called upon to serve as "organizational consultant, communications expert, outside observer, participant observer, situation describer, and school anthropologist." All of these roles, Drummond feels, have to do with governance, funding, management, delivering instructional and technical services, and assessing and evaluating and disseminating data. He adds that shifts in

perceptions and functions have already resulted in the formation of instructional teams, consisting of teachers, administrators and university personnel.

The third major implication for higher education is that universities will pursue field-based models and begin to examine how to intervene effectively from the outside and to work with rural educators. Recent work in teacher centers has developed some relevant models. Teacher center "field agents" are persons who work with an organization in an attempt to facilitate change, but who are not part of that organization. (Boston & Kingsford, 1981). According to Boston and Kingsford, many teachers agree with Gene Hall that change is made first by individuals, then by groups, then by institutions, and that failure to recognize this personal aspect of change is the major reason why so many change efforts have failed in our public schools. They believe the more field agents can communicate and work with their clientele on a face-to-face basis, the more they can build a sense of empathy and mutual trust, factors which greatly enhance the probability of the successful implementation and institutionalization of any change. (Berman & McLaughlin, 1980).

Paul Nachtigal (1980) reinforced these concepts, giving much of the responsibility for moving ahead to those working in rural education and those who live in the rural community.

A lesson that comes through exceedingly clear from the case studies is that planning done for rural people does not lead to successful implementation. It denies them the will and capacity to undertake action on their own behalf. It is out of step with rural traditions. However, they can not do it alone. Local people and rural educators must be linked with knowledgeable professionals in relationships of mutual trust and commitment. This implies the involvement of professional experts with local people over the long term and at each step of the development process.

In conclusion, it is clear that in order to improve rural education, institutions of higher education need to be much more aggressive about their role in preparing teachers and administrators for rural settings. They need to establish special programs, work directly with and in the rural communities and maintain ongoing relationships with rural educators. Only by identifying and pursuing the

needs of the rural educational community will nearby colleges and universities become integral to rural education.

REFERENCES

- A national problem: recruitment and retention of specialized personnel in rural areas. Second Special Edition of the National Rural Project, November, 1980.
- Abt, W.P., Bock, G., English, P., and Marx, T.J. (Abt Associates) One year out; reports of rural high school graduates. ERIC/CRESS, 1977. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 148 510)
- Bass, G. and Burman, P. (Rand Report). Federal aid to rural schools; Current patterns and unmet needs. Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, California, 1979.
- Boston, B.D. and Kingsford, S. (Eds.) Field agency in teacher centers. Southeast Idaho Teacher Center Consortium, Twin Falls, Idaho, June 1981. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED. 207 958).
- Castro, Glendon; and others. Training, recruiting, and retaining personnel in rural areas. Making it work in rural communities. A Rural Network Monograph, Western Illinois University, August 1981. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 211 303).
- Conference Proceedings: annual Colorado conference of rural education. Fort Collins, Colorado, June 7-8, 1981. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 212 393).
- Drummond, W.H., Houston, W. R. and Massonari, K. (Eds.) Emerging role of the college based teacher education. Emerging professional roles for teacher educators. Washington, D.C., AACTE, 1978.
- Edington, E. Rural youth: the neglected minority. A presentation in the College of Education Dialogue Series, New Mexico State University, 1978.
- Fratoe, F.A. Rural education and rural labor force in the seventies. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Rural Development Research Report No. 5, 1978.
- Gardener, C.E. and Edington, E. The preparation and certification of teachers for rural and small schools. ERIC/CRESS, November, 1982.
- Herriott, R.E. Federal initiatives and rural school improvement: finding for the experimental schools program. Abt Associates, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1980.
- Horn, J.G. Higher education's response to the needs of rural schools. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, California, 13 April 1981. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 201 435).
- Ivey, E., II. Developing and administering a nonmetropolitan teacher education program. West Virginia Wesleyan College, Buckhannon, West Virginia, August 1979. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 189 031).

- Kersh, B.Y. Needed: new ways of thinking and acting in staff development. Journal of Teacher Education, Jan.-Feb. 1979, 30(1), 44-46.
- Krueger, R. Rural inservice education: staples teacher center style. January 1981. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 206 579).
- Lieberman, A. Linking processes in educational change. In Linking Processes in Educational Improvement, edited by Nash, Nicholes, and Culbertson, University Council for Educational Administration, Columbus, Ohio, 1977.
- Muse, I.D., Parsons, R.J. and Hope, E.W. A study of rural teachers and the rural schools as perceived by school administrators, teachers, parents and students. Rural/Regional Education News, Rural Regional Education Association, November 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 119 921).
- Muse, I.D. and Stonehocker, L. A study of small rural high schools of less than 200 students; perceptions of teachers and administrators. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California, April 1979. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 168 778).
- Nachtigal, P.M. Improving rural schools. National Institute of Education, Sept. 1980. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 192 992).
- Sher, J.P. Revitalizing rural education: a legislator's handbook. National Conference of State Legislatures, Washington, D.C.,; National Rural Center, Washington, D. C., Sept. 78. (ERIC document Reproduction Service No. ED 168 750).
- Sher, J.P. (Ed.) Education in rural America: a reassessment of conventional wisdom. Boulder, Colorado, Westview Press, 1977.
- Small community and rural development policy. The Carter Administration, U.S. Government Printing Office, Dec. 20, 1979, 634-655/644.
- Surwill, B.J. School of Education Quarterly. Billings, Montana: Eastern Montana College, September 1980, 6(3).
- Warner, R.W., Jr., and Kale, K.E. Rural education: a field of study whose time has come in higher education. 1981. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 207 757).
- Whitfield, T. Responsive staff development and continuing education for rural school districts. Some issues and approaches. Feb. 1981. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 199 234).

APPENDIX A

Taken from The Preparation and Certification of Teachers for Rural and Small Schools by Gardener & Edington.

Teacher Preparation and Inservice Practices, Including Models

In general preservice teacher preparation programs can be classified into categories. Rather than attempting to list all the programs that are now available, this paper shall give examples of various classifications and models of the program.

The most common preservice programs for rural educators are field-centered or field-based practicum where the student teacher is exposed to the realities of teaching and living in rural communities. The field-centered approach allows the student teacher to have a better perception of the demands and rewards of teaching in rural areas. The program has produced teachers who are willing to teach in the small schools and are more content with the life and work in rural communities, thereby decreasing the teacher-turnover rate (Muse, 1978).

The leader in field-centered education programs was Berea College in Eastern Kentucky (Buckland, 1958; Ivey, 1979). The Appalachian region of that state was having difficulty in obtaining and retaining qualified teachers. Through a program which allowed the students to work in the community on improvement programs not necessarily related to the schools, the potential teachers gained a better understanding of the social and economic conditions of the area. Also, the prospective teachers were accepted as a part of the community.

Western Michigan University has had a rural education program in field-centered education since 1927. Recently the university has re-examined its program to better meet the needs of rural educators (Muse, 1977).

Brigham Young University and 10 rural Utah school districts have developed a field-based, competencies-centered approach that has been emulated by several other colleges since its conception in 1972. Student teachers are required to spend from 8 to 16 weeks living and teaching in a rural community. While in the rural communities, the trainees are assigned to a collaborating local teacher. Trainees complete much of their professional coursework on-site by using two rural training centers, each over 100 miles from the university, which provide training manuals, instructional materials, and individualized teaching units. The centers are also used for seminars, social occasions, and for conferences with university supervisors, center directors, and others. During the initial program, the regular teachers are given in-depth inservice training on campus while the student teachers are in the teachers' classrooms under the direction of university personnel. Upon completion of the program, a high percentage of the students has shown a preference for teaching and living in a rural area, and participating schools have generally hired the students who have served in the program (Muse, 1977, 1978).

Brigham Young University has expanded its program of rural education to include an ED.D. program for rural educators and a program for recruitment and training of teachers for employment in Utah's rural Indian reservation schools (Rural Education Association, 1980).

Texas A&M University (Garcia & Parker, 1981-82) has developed a program called "Teacher Preparation for Rural Schools" which is a field-based approach. The program provides potential rural teachers with opportunities to play key instructional roles in rural schools while gaining formal academic training at the university. It is a four-year program with on-the-job experience which culminates in a B.S. degree and certification as an elementary teacher. The program offers experience in the following areas: (1) teacher aide; (2) curriculum developer/resource person;

(3) Ombudsman/community school relations; (4) student teacher. The students are also required to attend a bi-monthly seminar where participants discuss their experiences and relate them to essential academic training.

Another system of teacher preparation is that of recruiting potential teachers from among local people. In Idaho (Muse, 1977), 53 districts found that their local districts contained a number of long-time residents who were outstanding teacher prospects but who lacked the necessary credentials. The districts, in conjunction with Idaho State University, developed individual course syllabi for 12 separate disciplines and professional courses which were offered in the local communities by the College of Education. The student teachers taught in the classrooms, prepared media/materials for the classrooms, and performed other tasks common to teachers in small schools. Courses necessary for completion of requirements were provided by the University. The program reduced the adjustment problems usually experienced by new teachers and also reduced teacher turnover.

A third program that can be used for teacher preparation combines preservice and inservice teacher training. Professors, graduate students, and other students who have completed their student teaching take the place of the teachers in the school. While the university personnel are teaching the students, the school staff is involved in an intensive inservice training program. The exchange program has received enthusiastic support from participants.

In Oregon (Hull, 1979), a group of 15 students went to a small community where they lived with the teachers in the community for three days. The faculty from the school received inservice training from graduate students and professors while students in the teacher training program taught classes for the regular classroom teachers. The program helped prospective teachers change their attitudes toward rural education while giving the classroom teachers a chance for inservice training.

The exchange program requires a great deal of cooperation and pre-planning to be successful, but it is a very effective program for developing and increasing

relations between the universities and the communities.

In 1976 Western Montana College (Montana Schools, 1980; Zelter, 1981) became the Rural Education Center for Montana. The college is unique in its approach which emphasizes personal contact with rural staff members. Western Montana College conceives its role as a linker or change agent between rural classrooms and those who generate potentially useful knowledge and delivery systems. A field coordinator is used as a linking agent who travels throughout the state visiting the various areas to determine the needs of rural educators. This agent helps the college develop its delivery system.

Western Montana College is also using a field-based approach with its student teachers. Student teachers have been placed throughout rural Montana. This involves traveling great distances for college supervisors. Each spring for the past three years Western Montana College has also conducted Rural Education workshops for rural teachers where new techniques, programs, and available resources are shared. During the workshops, the teachers are given an opportunity to share their ideas and the problems of rural educators with each other and with the center's staff. In the fall of 1981, the center also conducted workshops in six areas throughout the state specifically for rural educators. Because of the vastness of the state and the differences in social and economic bases, Western Montana's linkage model, combined with the field-based and inservice programs, has promise of becoming very effective and may eventually serve as an exemplary model.

The state of Arkansas has also developed a linkage model to facilitate innovations in rural and small schools (Murphy, 1982). Their program was developed by the Department of Education to be a resource to funnel information to the districts. The Arkansas Department of Education has consolidated its information bases into one unit. A field facilitator serves as a linker who helps school districts analyze their needs, serves as a catalyst, and helps the districts with services to match their needs.

Utilizing this system has increased communications and solved problems at a lower level, increased the creativity of the local districts in finding solutions, and increased school staffs' use of information and research. The program has helped the small schools to find viable and financially feasible changes in their educational programs.

By necessity, the four preservice programs (field-based, recruitment of local people, teacher exchange, and linkage models) have included some inservice programs. If a training program is to be efficient and is to help retain those already in the rural schools, it must also contain inservice programs to meet the current needs and to develop better school, institutional, and community relationships.

Staff training as an inservice program can involve in-school workshops, classes on university campuses, outdoor training in environmental education, and leadership training (Hoyt, 1981).

Programs and rural education conferences and workshops have developed in many areas. Because of the short duration of these staff training or information programs, many are not reported in the literature.

Another variant for inservice training is the field-based professor. In a rural Georgia area (Bruce & others, 1975; Hubright & others, 1974), the community and the administration were unwilling to have educators who knew nothing of the community's needs instructing their teachers and their students. The university sent four professors to the school who taught on-site courses which could meet the needs of the community. The courses were abbreviated in class hours and featured the professors working in the classroom with the teachers, using the class hours as a laboratory for introducing new ideas and for helping the teachers develop innovative approaches.

Cadre training (Cashmere Consolidated School District, 1979) was used for a project in Washington state. During a 10-day workshop, 51 participants trained

in a program for rural educators. Upon completion of the course, the 51 trainees gave a workshop to other teachers, administrators, school board members, guidance and media specialists, and community members.

Self-instructional materials have been used to develop inservice training in particular subjects. Utah State University (Henderson, 1976) developed packets of self-instructional materials to train elementary teachers to deal with mildly handicapped children in their classrooms. With the technology of today, many of the packets can contain slides, audio or video tapes, workbooks, and other multimedia materials. This approach is very efficient as it saves faculty instructional time and saves travel time for the university staff and the recipient.

Television and satellite technology are also being used to bring inservice training to rural teachers in isolated areas. The Appalachian Education Satellite project (Bramble & others, 1975) conducted four graduate courses for teachers in Appalachia by using NASA's AT-6 communications satellite at 15 sites throughout the Appalachian region, from New York to Alabama.

Satellite radio has also been used for teacher-to-teacher professional communications and to provide continuing educational opportunities for teachers in isolated areas. In Alaska (NEA, 1975), a 13-week course, accredited for 3 hours by the University of Alaska School of Education and sponsored by the National Education Association, was implemented to help teachers in remote areas. Support material on each topic was mailed to the participants in the villages well in advance of the radio broadcasts.

Although there is no "one" method which will always be effective, many universities are realizing the need to implement rural teacher preparation programs. The type of program to be implemented is dependent upon the needs of the area served. Johathon Sher in his book, Education in Rural America; A Reassessment of Conventional Wisdom, says it well:

The primacy of local circumstances must be respected. Rural American may well represent the single most diverse and heterogeneous group of individuals and communities in our society. Thus the notion of an educational panacea--that is, an educational reform strategy that is applicable and effective throughout rural America--is ludicrous. Any reform strategy that seeks to circumvent local traditions, values, beliefs, and capabilities, rather than building upon them, is bound to fail. (pp. 274-275)